



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/849,437	05/07/2001	Masamitsu Nakaminami	0071/007001	8635

22893 7590 07/17/2002

SMITH PATENT OFFICE  
1901 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE N W  
SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

MILLER, BENA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3712

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/849,437

Applicant(s)

NAKAMINAMI ET AL.

Examiner

Bena Miller

Art Unit

3712

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1, 7 and 11, the examiner is not sure as to what is meant by the phrase "farther from the operator". The examiner is not sure of the location of the operator. For example only, it is unclear as to what position defines the operator as being farther from the headstock. Again, in claim 7, it is unclear as to what position defines the operator as being closer to the tool posts.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 7, 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Matthey.

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Matthey teaches in figures 1-4 a machine tool comprising a fixed bed (1), a pair of tool posts (17 and 22; it is noted that turrets 17 and

Application/Control Number: 09/849,437

Art Unit: 3712

22 are considered to be the posts), carriages (14, 19) and a headstock base (6) configured as claimed.

Regarding claims 4 and 8, Matthey further teaches that the one of the carriages are disposed on a left side and the other disposed on the right side of the fixed bed in figure 1.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthey in view of Kosho et al.

Matthey teaches in the figures the invention substantially as claimed. However, Matthey fails to teach a chip collecting opening and a tunnel formed in the fixed bed. Kosho teaches in figures 1-9 a lathe having bed body 2 formed by a box-like rear body portion 3 and a box-like front body portions 4. Box-like front body portions 4 forms a cut materials discharging space 20 as seen in figures 1 and 2. Once the materials enter space 20 the materials are discharged in discharging space 20, which is located in the rear portion of base body 2 (col. 6, par. 5 and 6). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a chip collecting opening and a tunnel as taught by Kosho in the fixed bed of Matthey since

Application/Control Number: 09/849,437  
Art Unit: 3712

Page 4


Kosho teaches that such modification would receive cut materials which are discharged during cutting processing (col. 6, paragraph 5).

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Bazuin teaches a turret lathe. Fetty teaches a radial universal tool. Minagawa teaches a carriage structure of NC lathe. Niedbala et al teach a machine tool.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bena Miller whose telephone number is 703.305.0643. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

bbm  
July 13, 2002

  
**Jacob K. Ackun**  
Primary Examiner